



SEC.636
09/313,659

B

ABP

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of:

Won-suk YANG et al.

Group Art Unit: 2814

Application Serial No.: 09/313,659

Examiner: S. Rao

Filed: May 18, 1999

Title: METHOD FOR FABRICATING A SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

#12/4r.
9/26/01
Purles

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Sir:


In the Notice of Allowability dated April 11, 2001, the Examiner indicated that the undersigned authorized amendments to claims 9, 18, and 19. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the undersigned did not authorize the Examiner to make any amendments to any pending claims in this application. A discussion of the substance of the telephone interviews made by the undersigned with the Examiner are set forth in the Interview Summary being filed along with this paper.

Noted
O.C.
9/26/01

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make these comments of record in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jones Volentine, L.L.C

Match & Return


Brian C. Altmiller
Reg. No. 37,271

Date: April 19, 2001

Jones Volentine, L.L.C.
12200 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 150
Reston, Virginia 20191
(703) 715-0870



SEC.636
09/313,659

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:

Won-suk YANG et al.

Group Art Unit: 2814

Application Serial No.: 09/313,659

Examiner: S. Rao

Filed: May 18, 1999

Title: METHOD FOR FABRICATING A SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Sir:

On March 1, 2001, and March 7, 2001, the undersigned spoke with Examiner Stephen Rao by telephone regarding the final Office Action dated January 25, 2001, issued in this case. A summary of what was discussed is given below.

During these interviews, the undersigned discussed with the Examiner the finality of the January 25th Office Action, the rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and the rejections of claims 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Regarding the finality of the Office Action dated January 25, 2001, the undersigned noted that a new rejection was applied to claim 15 in this Office Action, which had not been amended in a previous response. Therefore the finality of this Office Action was improper and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner considered these arguments, but would not comment on them.

Rather, he requested that the undersigned include them in a written response to the Office Action, and that the Examiner would consider them fully at that time.

Regarding the pending rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the undersigned repeated the arguments from the response filed November 15, 2000, offering additional comments to assist the Examiner in understanding them.

In the March 1, 2001, conversation, the Examiner indicated that he would present these arguments to his supervisor. In the March 7, 2001, conversation, the Examiner indicated that his supervisor agreed with these comments relating to the patentability of claims 1-19 over the cited prior art.

Regarding the pending rejection of claims 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Examiner proposed an amendment that he stated would overcome this rejection. In particular, he recommended deleting any reference to BF_2 in claims 9 and 19.

The undersigned noted that he would pass this proposed amendment to the Applicants for review. However, no final determination was made regarding any claim amendments, and the undersigned did not agree to any of the proposed amendments.

During these telephone conversations, the Examiner noted that he did not wish to withdraw the Office Action of January 25, 2001, nor did he wish to work through these matters by Examiner's Amendment. Rather, he requested that the undersigned file a response to the pending Office Action and include a reference to these telephone

interviews, and the arguments made during these interviews. In particular, the Examiner specifically requested that the response address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as discussed in these interviews.

On April 11, 2001, the Examiner issued a Notice of Allowance with a form PTO-413 Interview Summary. In this summary of the interviews referenced above, the Examiner correctly noted that the patentability of claims 1-19 over the prior art was discussed.

The Examiner made no mention in this Interview Summary regarding the substance of the interviews as they related to the finality of the Office Action or the rejection of claims 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The above comments provide a description of these aspects of the interviews.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make these comments of record in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jones Volentine, L.L.C



Brian C. Altmiller
Reg. No. 37,271

Date: April 19, 2001

Jones Volentine, L.L.C.
12200 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 150
Reston, Virginia 20191
(703) 715-0870